

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 3, 5, 13, 14, and 36 are in the application, with Claims 1 and 36 being independent. Claims 1 and 36 have been amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3, 13 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,400 (Park). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Park in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,616,968 (Fujii). Claims 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Park in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,448,489 (Kimura). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

According to a feature of the invention as recited by Claims 1 and 36, the power converting apparatus is connected to a commercial electric-power system, and comprises a switch arranged to make/break connection between the transforming circuit and the commercial electric-power system.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that “electric power system” can be defined as a “complex assemblage of equipment and circuits for generating, transmitting, transforming, and distributing electric energy.” See McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, Fifth Edition, 1994, which is cited in the accompanying Information Disclosure Statement.

None of Park, Fujii, and Kimura, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, is seen to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed feature.

The Office Action alleges that Park’s relay (not shown) and transforming circuit (230) correspond, respectively, to the switch and the transforming circuit recited in

the instant claims. However, nowhere is Park seen to describe that his relay (not shown) is arranged to make/break connection between the transforming circuit (230) and a commercial electric-power system.

Fujii and Kimura are not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Park.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from an independent claim discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Turning to a formal matter, it appears that the Examiner inadvertently failed to initial one of the Forms PTO-1449 returned with the January 28, 2008 Office Action. In particular, the Form PTO-1449 submitted with the December 27, 2001 Information Disclosure Statement was not initialed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner return an initialed copy of this Form PTO-1449 with the next Office communication.

#### REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

If upon consideration of this Amendment, the Examiner still has concerns as to the patentability of the claims, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative to arrange an interview.

#### CONCLUSION

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Damond E. Vadnais/  
Damond E. Vadnais  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 2931403v1